

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 19-40 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 19, 21, 29-31, and 38 have been amended.

§112 Rejection of Claims 19-36 and 38

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 19-36 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. As shown above claims 19, 30 and 38 have been amended, thereby obviating the rejections of claims 19, 30, and 38, as well as the rejections of claims 20-29 that depend from claim 19 and of claims 31-36 that depend from claim 30.

Regarding claim 19, the Examiner has argued that it is not clear to what the “control component” and the “information signal component” are referring. The amendments to the language in claim 19 clarify this language. The control component controls the operation of the information signal transmission system. In an implementation corresponding to Figure 1, the control component corresponds to the control block 7 shown in Figure 1. The information signal component reproduces and outputs an information signal. In an implementation corresponding to Figure 1, the information signal component corresponds to the video reproduction block 6 and the video output block 8 shown in Figure 1. (See, e.g., Figure 1 and the specification at pages 8 and 9.)

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner’s rejection of claims 19-36 based upon 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been obviated and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§102 and §103 Rejections of Claims 19-40 over Harada

In Section 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 19-22, 22-24, and 26-40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Harada et al. (U.S. Patent 5,721,583; hereinafter referred to as “Harada”). In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 21 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada. Harada was filed on November 26, 1996. Accordingly, the effective date of Harada under §102(e) is November 26, 1996. The filing date of the priority document (Japanese application 8-330439) for the present application is also November 26, 1996. Therefore, Harada is not available as a proper reference under §102(e) or §102(e)/ §103 because the effective date of Harada is not before the priority date of the present application. A verified English translation of the priority document is submitted with this Amendment. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that these rejections have been obviated and so withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 19-40 is respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.


In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Hans R. Mahr, Reg. No. 46,138 for
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800